

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/060,041	01/28/2002	Michael J. Lyden	279.057US4	6579	
21186 7	7590 06/14/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			SCHAETZLE, KENNEDY		
P.O. BOX 293 MINNEAPOL	8 IS, MN 55402		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	20,		3762		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

:	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Commons	10/060,041	LYDEN, MICHAEL J.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Kennedy Schaetzle	3762		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period who Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	ely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.	
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>.</u> .			
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E.			merits is	
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 26-78 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 38-78 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 26 and 28 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 27 and 29-37 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2002 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies.	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage	
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:)-152)	

Art Unit: 3762

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the patent numbers of issued applications referenced throughout the specification must be provided.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 26 and 28 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,283. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the step of selecting a pacing supply operating frequency for the switching power supply to reduce a current required to recharge the pacing supply capacitor before a subsequent pacing pulse in a series of pacing pulses is covered by the patent's more narrow recitation that the at least two capacitors in said cardiac pacing device which are used to transfer charge from the power supply to the storage capacitor are alternately configured at a frequency of switching. Furthermore, the "... to reduce a current..." recitation is clearly a statement of

Application/Control Number: 10/060,041 Page 3

Art Unit: 3762

desired result and would be an inherent outcome of practicing the patented invention. In addition, whether the pacing pulse is one in a series of pacing pulses or a lone pulse is immaterial to the invention. It would be obvious that if the patented method's manipulation of a single pulse works in extending battery life, then it would also work with a series of pulses. Whether one issues a single pulse or a series of pulses is contingent on the condition of the individual under treatment. The step of monitoring battery charge depletion is akin to the patented method's step of monitoring a decrease in battery strength. The step of increasing the pacing supply operating frequency to compensate for the increasing charge times of the pacing supply capacitor is met by the patented method's more narrow step of increasing the frequency of switching at which the at least two charge transfer capacitors are alternatively configured in a charge filling phase from the battery and a charge delivery phase to a pace output capacitor.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 26 and 28 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, but would be allowable upon the timely submission of an acceptable Terminal Disclaimer as discussed in paragraph 2 above.

Regarding claim 26, prior artisans do not disclose the recited step of increasing the pacing supply operating frequency to compensate for the increasing charge times of the pacing supply capacitor.

- 5. Claims 27 and 29-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. Claims 38-78 are allowed.

Regarding claim 38, the prior art of record fails to disclose steps of setting a voltage multiplier setting for the switching power supply to a reduced setting that is greater than Vpace/Vstop; and reducing the pacing supply operating frequency setting to a reduced setting that is greater than the setting in which the charge time for the pacing supply capacitor is greater than the cardiac cycle interval.

Art Unit: 3762

Concerning claim 50, the prior art does not appear to disclose the recited switching power supply with at least two capacitors and a frequency input for controlling switching frequency between a fill configuration and a dump configuration.

The frequency controlling circuitry of claim 69 is not disclosed by prior artisans.

Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kennedy Schaetzle whose telephone number is 703 308-2211. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 -6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 703 308-0851. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KJS June 8, 2004

PRIMARYEXAMINED